

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

The claims pending for consideration are claims 1-17.

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize novel, patentable aspects of the applicants' invention.

Basis for the amendments to claim 1 is found at page 1, lines 34-36 and page 4, lines 19-21.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3 and 16 as anticipated by Rebh (USPG Pub. No. 2003/0063052). The applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3 and 16 define subject matter which is novel over Rebh, particularly as claim 1 has been amended.

More specifically, it is noted that the applicants' invention is concerned with an OLED device (claim 16) and method of making same (claims 1 and 3). Such a device differs from Rebh in that an OLED device is an organic light emitting device (OLEO), i.e. one wherein the active electroluminescent (EL) layer comprises organic material (see page 4, lines 26-27 of applicants' specification). In contrast, the device of Rebh does not comprise an organic EL material, but instead the emitter is a phosphor, i.e. an inorganic material (see layer 52 in Figure 4 of Rebh).

In addition, in the applicants' invention as defined in method claims 1 and 3 and the device claim 16, the blocking layer is located between the EL layer and one of the electrodes, i.e. either the anode or the cathode. In contrast, the EL device shown in Figure 4 of Rebh comprises a phosphor EL layer 52, a rear electrode 56, an ITO treated polyester layer 40 serving as front electrode (see paragraph 0037, line 7), and a patterned dielectric layer 58, but wherein this patterned dielectric layer 58 is located on the side of the rear electrode 56 facing away from the phosphor EL layer 52, i.e. not between the EL layer 52 and the electrode 56 or 40.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that claims 1, 3 and 16 are novel over Rebh. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 102(e) rejection of these claims is requested.

The Examiner is also requested to reconsider and withdraw the Section 103(a) rejections of the applicants' other claims based on the combination of Rebh with Pennaz (U.S. 6,922,020) (claim 2); with Morii (U.S. 7,300,686) (claims 4, 6-8, 10-11 and 14); with Morri and Narang (U.S. 6,855,378) (claim 5); with Hyman (USPG Pub. No. 2003/0035917) (claim 9); with Murasko et al. (USPG Pub. No.

2003/0015962) (claims 12-13); with Jagannathan (USPG Pub. No. 2003/0030706) (claim 15); and with Hanson (USPG Pub. No. 2003/0035972) (claim 17). Rebh, with or without the secondary references, does not make the applicants' invention obvious, particularly as the invention is more specifically defined in main claim 1. Clearly the secondary references do not fill in the substantive differences between the applicants' invention and Rebh as noted above.

The method of applicants' claim 1 enables the manufacture of an OLED device for displaying an image in a very simple time- and cost-efficient way, by providing a blocking ink between two of the active OLED layers, e.g. between the electroluminescent (EL) layer and either the anode or the cathode. The blocking layer is provided between any two layers in the OLED and blocks the charge movement in the area of the pattern.

In the applicants' method of claim 1 the blocking layer can be deposited in a desired pattern e.g. by inkjet printing. The EL layer is then deposited directly onto the blocking layer (or vice versa). As shown in Figure 1, since the EL layer (45) contacts the patterned blocking layer (44), it will automatically form a pattern, too. In the regions of the blocking layer (44) the device will therefore not emit light (see also description of Figure 1 on page 6, line 18). The EL layer can thus be applied uniformly across the device, for example as a coating, without the need of being actively patterned itself. This yields improved image quality and saves the additional effort of patterning the EL layer.


This method and the improvements thereby achieved are not in any way suggested by the Rebh reference. Rebh does neither disclose nor suggest an OLED comprising a patterned blocking layer, which is located between the EL layer and the electrode and blocks the charge movement in the area of the pattern. Furthermore, none of the Examiner's other cited references discloses or suggests such a device or a method for its preparation.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that all of their claims define subject matter which is not only new but also unobvious from the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By 
Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16773

Date: June 19, 2008

Customer No. 09629
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001
Direct: (202) 739-5455